

DOUGLAS E. LUMISH (Bar No. 183863)  
doug.lumish@lw.com  
JEFFREY G. HOMRIG (Bar No. 215890)  
jeff.homrig@lw.com  
GABRIEL S. GROSS (Bar No. 254672)  
gabe.gross@lw.com  
NIKOLAUS A. WOLOSZCZUK (Bar No. 286633)  
nick.woloszczuk@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
140 Scott Drive  
Menlo Park, California 94025  
Tel: (650) 328-4600; Fax: (650) 463-2600

JOSEPH. H. LEE (Bar No. 248046)  
joseph.lee@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
750 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor  
Costa Mesa, California 92626  
Tel: (714) 540-1253; Fax: (714) 755-8290

MICHAEL B. EISENBERG (*pro hac vice*)  
michael.eisenberg@lw.com  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
885 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022-4834  
Tel: (212) 906-1200; Fax (212) 751-4864

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Counterclaim Defendants  
TransPerfect Global, Inc.; TransPerfect Translations  
International, Inc.; and Translations.com, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

TRANSPERFECT GLOBAL, INC.,  
TRANSPERFECT TRANSLATIONS  
INTERNATIONAL, INC., AND  
TRANSLATIONS.COM, INC.,

Plaintiffs/Counterclaim-Defendants,

v.

MOTIONPOINT CORPORATION,  
Defendant/Counterclaimant.

Case No. CV 10-02590 CW (JCS)

**TRANSPERFECT'S NOTICE OF  
AMENDED BILL OF COSTS AND  
AMENDED BILL OF COSTS**

Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken

TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT, TO DEFENDANT AND COUNTERCLAIM  
PLAINTIFF MOTIONPOINT CORPORATION, AND TO COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1) and Civil L.R. 54-1, Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants TransPerfect Global, Inc., TransPerfect Translations International, Inc., and Translations.com, Inc. (collectively “TransPerfect”) hereby submit their Amended Bill of Costs. TransPerfect’s Amended Bill of Costs is based on this Notice, the summary of costs below, the accompanying declaration of Jim Iseman, the first and second declarations of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk and attached exhibits with the itemized costs, the pleadings, orders and papers on file herein, and any matters of which the Court may take judicial notice, and additional evidence and argument as may be later presented.

**Amended Bill of Costs**

On November 15, 2013, this Court entered judgment in the above-entitled action against Defendant and Counterclaimant MotionPoint Corporation, and ordered that TransPerfect recover its costs. (D.N. 467.) Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1) and Civil L.R. 54-1, TransPerfect respectfully requests the Clerk to tax the following as costs:

Civil L.R. 54-3(a) (Fees for Filing and Service of Process)	\$16,206.90
Civil L.R. 54-3(b) (Reporters’ Transcripts)	\$20,449.57
Civil L.R. 54-3(c) (Depositions)	\$111,091.83
Civil L.R. 54-3(d) (Reproduction and Exemplification)	\$273,654.16
Civil L.R. 54-3(e) (Witness Expenses)	\$10,418.36
Total Costs	\$431,820.82

1. **Clerk’s Filing Fees and Service of Subpoenas**

28 U.S.C. § 1920(1) permits recovery of “fees of the clerk and marshal,” in this district

1 this includes both fees paid directly to the Court Clerk and the costs of private service of  
 2 subpoenas. Civ. L.R. 54-3(a)(2). TransPerfect incurred clerk fees of \$1,475 for filing court  
 3 documents and pro hac vice admissions, and \$14,731.90 for service of subpoenas. While there is  
 4 no rule regarding pro hac vice fees in the 9th Circuit, this Court has allowed recovery of such  
 5 fees. *Kalitta Air, LLC v. Cent. Tex. Airborne Sys.*, No. C 96-2494, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 6 172679, \*8 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2012). These necessary costs are documented in Exhibit A to the  
 7 First Declaration of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk. (D.N. 474.)

8       2.     Reporters' Transcripts of Hearings

9       28 U.S.C. § 1920 allows recovery of “fees for printed or electronically recorded  
 10 transcripts necessarily obtained for use in the case.” Civil L.R. 54-3(b)(1) additionally specifies  
 11 that “the costs of transcripts necessarily obtained for an appeal is allowable.” Courts in this  
 12 district have found transcripts taxable where the hearing “was of paramount importance in the  
 13 case.” *See MEMC Elec. Materials v. Mitsubishi Materials*, No. C-01-4925, 2004 U.S. Dist.  
 14 LEXIS 29359, \*8-9 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2004) (approving of transcripts costs for Markman  
 15 hearing); *eBay Inc. v. Kelora Sys., LLC*, C 10-4947, 2013 WL 1402736, \*11 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5,  
 16 2013) (allowing cost of transcript from summary judgment and non-infringement hearing).

17       TransPerfect also incurred costs obtaining transcripts for each day of trial, these  
 18 transcripts were necessarily obtained in anticipation of an appeal which MotionPoint has  
 19 confirmed is forthcoming. Paul Demery, *In a Web Translation Patent Battle, the Jury Sides with*  
 20 *TransPerfect*, July 29, 2013, [http://www.internetretailer.com/mobile/2013/07/29/jury-sides-](http://www.internetretailer.com/mobile/2013/07/29/jury-sides-transperfect-web-translation-patent-battle)  
 21 [transperfect-web-translation-patent-battle](http://www.internetretailer.com/mobile/2013/07/29/jury-sides-transperfect-web-translation-patent-battle) (MotionPoint “said in a statement that it ‘intends to  
 22 appeal the jury’s verdict and will pursue all other avenues to protect its intellectual property.’”).  
 23 *See Affymetrix, Inc. v. Multilyte Ltd.*, No. C 03-03779, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41177, \*5-6 (N.D.  
 24 Cal. Aug. 26, 2005) (“It was reasonable for Affymetrix to incur the expense of transcripts for all  
 25 court proceedings, given that this case was so contentiously litigated. . . . It is only expected that  
 26 both parties found it necessary to obtain transcripts for appeal.”) (emphasis added); *Asyst Techs.*  
 27 *v. Emtrak Inc.*, No. C 98-20451, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23834, \*5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2009)  
 28 (allowing recovery of costs for daily trial transcripts in a patent infringement trial because the

1 prevailing party “knew with virtual certainty that however the trial came out the losing party  
 2 would appeal.”) Given the parties’ relationship as competitors, and considering the amount of  
 3 damages at stake and the likelihood that an injunction would issue, it was reasonable for  
 4 TransPerfect to obtain daily transcripts in anticipation of an appeal. A spreadsheet of these costs  
 5 and true and correct copies of invoices supporting these costs are attached as Exhibit B to the  
 6 First Declaration of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk. (D.N. 474.)

### 7 3. Depositions

8 Civil L.R. 54-3(c) permits the recovery of “the cost of an original and one copy of any  
 9 deposition (including videotaped depositions) taken for any purpose in connection with the  
 10 case.” Courts in this district have awarded costs for both stenographic transcripts and copies of  
 11 video from the same deposition, acknowledging that “[i]n patent cases, costs for both have been  
 12 allowed as commonplace practice.” *eBay*, 2013 WL 1402736, at \*11 (internal quotation marks  
 13 and citation omitted); *see also Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.*, C 09-01714, 2012 WL 6761576,  
 14 \*7 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2012). Civil L.R. 54-3(c)(3) also allows recovery of the cost of  
 15 “reproducing exhibits to depositions.” A spreadsheet of these costs and true and correct copies  
 16 of invoices supporting these costs are attached as Exhibit B to the First Declaration of Nikolaus  
 17 A. Woloszczuk. (D.N. 474.)

### 18 4. Reproduction and Exemplification of Discovery Documents

19 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1920(3-4) and Civil L.R. 54-3(d), the costs of reproducing discovery  
 20 documents including certain costs associated with electronic discovery production are taxable.  
 21 *In re Ricoh Co. Patent Litig.*, 661 F.3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (“the costs of producing a  
 22 document electronically can be recoverable under section 1920(4).”); *eBay*, 2013 WL 1402736,  
 23 at \*7 (allowing recovery of electronic discovery costs such as “scanning paper documents,  
 24 electronic scanning and conversion to PDF, TIFF conversion, OCR, image endorsement/Bates  
 25 stamping, slip sheet preparation, blowback scanning paper documents, media hardware used for  
 26 production, electronically stamping Bates numbers, slipsheet preparation, blowback preparation,  
 27 and OCR conversion.”).

28 In *Plantronics*, the court found certain e-discovery costs (TIFF conversion and OCR

processing) to be recoverable, in part, because the parties had reached an agreement about the form of production. 2012 WL 6761576, \*15-16. TransPerfect and MotionPoint reached a similar agreement on the form of electronic discovery, agreeing to production in TIFF format, OCR processing, the provision of suitable load files, the provision of native files where necessary or requested, and the preservation of metadata. (Joint Case Management Conference Statement, D.N. 43 at 2-3.) TransPerfect incurred recoverable discovery costs both through the use of an outside vendor and by performing e-discovery tasks in-house. A spreadsheet of these costs and true and correct copies of invoices supporting these costs and a true and correct copy of a summary of in-house work performed by TransPerfect are attached as Amended Exhibit C to the accompanying Second Declaration of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk.

5. Reproduction and Exemplification of Government Records, and Trial Exhibits

Civil L.R. 54-3(d)(1) permits recovery of costs incurred “reproducing and certifying or exemplifying government records.” Civil L.R. 54-3(d)(4) also permits recovery of costs for “reproducing trial exhibits . . . to the extent that a Judge requires copies to be provided.” The Court’s standing order required the production of all trial exhibits in this action. TransPerfect has incurred necessary costs reproducing government records for the patents-in-suit as well as certain prior art patents and for providing the Court with copies of trial exhibits. TransPerfect also incurred costs preparing demonstrative exhibits and other visual aids to assist the jury and the Court in understanding the issues at trial. These costs are taxable under Civil L.R. 54-3(d)(5). The costs submitted for Latham & Watkins’ technical analyst are a true and accurate reflection of the hours billed to TransPerfect for time spent at trial presenting and being available to present trial exhibits and graphics using courtroom technology. A spreadsheet of these costs and true and correct copies of invoices supporting these costs as well as a true and correct copy of a summary of charges incurred for the Latham & Watkins technical analyst are attached as Amended Exhibit C to the accompanying Second Declaration of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk.

6. Witness Expenses

Civil L.R. 54-3(e) allows for the recovery of a witness’s per diem fee, subsistence, and travel expenses as provided for by 28 U.S.C. § 1821. TransPerfect’s advanced per diem and

1 mileage costs at the time it served subpoenas on MotionPoint and third-party witnesses. These  
2 costs are reflected in the same invoices submitted for recovery of the cost of service of  
3 subpoenas but are reproduced separately. TransPerfect also incurred additional witness expenses  
4 for Eric Silberstein's deposition and for the travel cost of bringing certain witnesses to trial. A  
5 spreadsheet of these costs and true and correct copies of invoices supporting these costs are  
6 attached as Exhibit D to the First Declaration of Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk. (D.N. 474.)  
7

8 Dated: December 6, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

9 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

10  
11 By /s/ Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk

Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk

12 Attorney for Plaintiffs/Counterclaim  
13 Defendants TransPerfect Global, Inc.;  
14 TransPerfect Translations International, Inc.;  
15 and Translations.com, Inc.

16 SV\1231792.1  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28